UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/499,248	02/07/2000	Sujata Das	07844-368001	9968

21876   7590   04/27/2004

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
3300 DAIN RAUSCHER PLAZA
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER
JONES, DAVID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2622	

DATE MAILED: 04/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

   A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
   THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
   - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
     after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
   - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
   - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
   - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
     Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
     earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _30 October 2002_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
     closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-19_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-19_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1.   Claims 9 and 10 are objected to because of the following informalities: claims 9 and 10

are identical to each other. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
> in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
> patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
> international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
> subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
> States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Notredame et al.

(US 6,049,390).

Regarding claim 1, Notredame et al. discloses a host-based method for identifying an

area within a color layer of a page that is not to be painted when producing a final output page,

the page including a gradient having a color definition in one of a plurality of color planes; the

method comprising:

a. defining a clip path for the gradient (fig. 9e, #947 & #945, column 13, lines 1-29);

b. converting the clip path to a high level representation (column 13, lines 48-64);

c. adding the high level representation of the converted clip path back to the page and identifying the high level representation as a knockout area that is not to be painted (column 13, lines 1-29).

Regarding claim 2, Notredame et al. discloses (fig. 9e, column 13, lines 1-29) a host-based method, wherein the step of defining includes reducing the gradient to one or more simple objects and identifying a set of the simple objects that bound the gradient.

Regarding claim 3, Notredame et al. discloses a host-based method, wherein the high level representation is a path object (column 18, lines 1-22).

Regarding claim 4, Notredame et al. discloses a host-based method, wherein the path object is a PDF path object (column 18, lines 1-22).

Regarding claim 5, Notredame et al. discloses a host-based method, wherein the step of converting includes converting the clip path to a PDF path object (column 13, lines 48-64 and column 18, lines 1-22).

Regarding claim 6, Notredame et al. discloses a host-based method, wherein the page is represented in PDF and the step of adding adds the PDF path object identifying the knockout area to the PDF representation of the page (column 16, lines 41-67 and column 17, lines 1-67, Table 1).

Regarding claim 7, Notredame et al. discloses a host-based method for identifying an area within a color layer of a page that is not to be painted when producing a final output page; the method comprising:

a. identifying an object that is to be overprinted and has a color definition that specifies color data for less than all of the color layers in the page (column 10, lines 16-33);

b. generating a knockout object associated with the identified object (fig. 9e, column 13, lines 1-29); and

c. adding the knockout object to the page (fig. 9e, column 13, lines 1-29).

Regarding claim 8, Notredame et al. discloses a host-based method, wherein the page is a separated page and the knockout object is added to a location in a marking list for the separated page at a same location as the identified object in a marking list for the page (column 16, lines 41-67 and column 17, lines 1-67, Table 1, #2).

Regarding claim 9, Notredame et al. discloses a host-based method, wherein the step of appending the knockout object to the page appends the knockout object in a marking list for the page immediately after the identified object (column 17, lines 13-67). Notredame states (column 16, lines 56-66) that since the user has the option of either writing the ordered list either manually or with the aid of the computer based system, therefore it would be inherent that one skilled in the art would understand that the placement of knockout object in the marking list can be edited and placement would be up to the user. As shown the knockout mark is after the background image or identified object in this case.

Regarding claim 10, Notredame et al. discloses a host-based method, wherein the step of appending the knockout object to the page appends the knockout object in a marking list for the page immediately after the identified object (column 17, lines 13-67). As is shown in column 17, lines 1-67, that the marking list includes the knockout mark as is shown in fig. 9e. Notredame states (column 16, lines 56-66) that since the user has the option of either writing the ordered list either manually or with the aid of the computer based system, therefore it would be inherent that one skilled in the art would understand that the placement of knockout object in the marking list

can be edited and placement would be up to the user. As shown the knockout mark is after the background image or identified object in this case.

Regarding claim 11, Notredame et al. discloses a host-based computer implemented method for identifying an area within a color layer of a page that is not to be painted when producing a final output page, the page including a gradient having a color definition in one of a plurality of color planes; the method including instructions for causing a computer to:

a. defining a clip path for the gradient (fig. 9, #947 & #945, column 13, lines 1-29);

b. converting the clip path to a high level representation (column 13, lines 48-64);

c. adding the high level representation of the converted clip path back to the page and identifying the high level representation as a knockout area that is not to be painted (column 13, lines 1-29).

Regarding claim 12, Notredame et al. discloses a host-based method, wherein the high level representation is a path object (column 18, lines 1-22).

Regarding claim 13, Notredame et al. discloses a host-based method, wherein the path object is a PDF path object (column 18, lines 1-22).

Regarding claim 14, Notredame et al. discloses a host-based method, wherein the step of converting includes converting the clip path to a PDF path object (column 13, lines 48-64 and column 18, lines 1-22).

Regarding claim 15, Notredame et al. discloses a host-based method, wherein the page is represented in PDF and the step of adding adds the PDF path object identifying the knockout area to the PDF representation of the page (column 16, lines 41-67 and column 17, lines 1-67, Table 1).

Regarding claim 16, Notredame et al. discloses a host-based computer implemented method for identifying an area within a color layer of a page that is not to be painted when producing a final output page; the method including instructions for causing the computer to:

a. identify an object that is to be overprinted and has a color definition that specifies color data for less than all of the color layers in the page (fig. 9e, #947 & #945, column 13, lines 1-29);

b. generate a knockout object associated with the identified object (fig. 9e, column 13, lines 1-29); and

c. append the knockout object to the page (column 17, lines 13-67). As is shown in column 17, lines 1-67, that the marking list includes the knockout mark as is shown in fig. 9e. Notredame states (column 16, lines 56-66) that since the user has the option of either writing the ordered list either manually or with the aid of the computer based system, therefore it would be inherent that one skilled in the art would understand that the placement of knockout object in the marking list can be edited and placement would be up to the user. As shown the knockout mark is after the background image or identified object in this case.

Regarding claim 17, Notredame et al. discloses a host-based method, wherein the method further comprises instructions to

a. create color separations including generate a separation page for each color plane in the final output for the page (column 11, lines 2-9); and

b. add the knockout object to a location in a marking list for the separated page at a same location as the identified object is located in a marking list for the page (column 16, lines 41-67 and column 17, lines 13-67, Table 1).

Regarding claims 18 and 19, Notredame et al. discloses a host-based method, further

comprises instructions to append the knockout object in a marking list for the page immediately

after the identified object (column 17, lines 13-67). As is shown in column 17, lines 1-67, that

the marking list includes the knockout mark as is shown in fig. 9e. Notredame states (column 16,

lines 56-66) that since the user has the option of either writing the ordered list either manually or

with the aid of the computer based system, therefore it would be inherent that one skilled in the

art would understand that the placement of knockout object in the marking list can be edited and

placement would be up to the user. As shown the knockout mark is after the background image

or identified object in this case.

Conclusion

4.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Bollman et al. (US 6,141,012) discloses a scheme that generates image processing

source code for custom applications automatically by using structured image (SI) technology in a

way that takes advantage of the unbound and incomplete features of SI.

Ahlstrom et al. (US 6,594,030) discloses a desktop publishing application program,

functionality is provided for automatic trapping of all page objects in a publication. Each page

object is trapped as completely as possible, meaning that each page object is subdivided into

atomic geometric or color page object components.

Gupta et al. (US 6,693,719) discloses an invention permits integrated clipping of a

subject polygon by a clip polygon and forming trapezoids filling the clipped area by activating

trapezoid formation at every vertex of either polygon and at every edge intersection. This

process saves code space and computer processing time. This invention efficiently utilizes the

resources of a multiprocessor integrated circuit by spawning of subtasks from a RISC type

processor to one or more DSP type processors.

Laverty et al. (US 6,381,032) discloses an on-line automated printing system that

quickly produces consistent printed materials. The system includes front-end customer setup and

product setup modules available on a web server. A Print Ready File is produced embodying

the product to be printed. The Print Ready File is compiled and all operations on the file can be

completed via reference to the information contained therein.

Bjorge et al. (US 5,295,236) discloses a trapping technique, which accepts a Postscript

or other page description language (PDL) file and outputs a file in PDL format having the

correct traps. The input page is first divided into sub-portions, or tiles, and the tiles are

individually processed by evaluating the input file in a corresponding clipping window.

Boenke et al. (US 5,438,653) discloses a computer system for production of ink

separations from an object-based print pre-process apparatus using a page description language.

The print pre-process system facilitates creation of object spreads for any combination or

configuration of objects on the rendered page.

Politis et al. (US 6,236,410) discloses a system that utilizes operators having the

graphical elements as operands in which the operators combine the operands according to a

function defined by the operators, the color information, and the opacity information, to

produce new graphical elements.

Barada et al. (US 6,330,072) discloses a method and apparatus for addressing the

problem of combining a plurality of Page Description Language (PDL) separation color files to

create a display list of objects that represents the composite or combined output image as

described by the PDL separation files. Furthermore, any conflicts about the z-order of the

display list are resolved by correctly ordering the objects in the display list to the extent that the

ordering is significant.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to David L Jones whose telephone number is (703) 305-4675. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (7:00am - 3:30pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on (703) 305-4712. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EDWARD COLES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

David L. Jones